

Massachusetts Water Resources Commission
Meeting Minutes for September 12, 1996

Commission Members in Attendance:

Peter C. Webber	Department of Environmental Management
Richard H. Thibedeau	Designee, Department of Environmental Management
Marilyn Contreas	Designee, Department of Housing & Community Development
Arleen O'Donnell	Designee, Department of Environmental Protection
Karen Pelto	Designee, Department of Fisheries Wildlife and Environmental Law Enforcement
Lee Corte-Real	Designee, Department of Food and Agriculture
Gary Clayton	Public Member
Francis J. Veale, Jr.	Public Member

Others in Attendance:

Lou Wagner	Massachusetts Audubon
Virginia Anderson	No. Sagamore Water District
Vivian Stowe	No. Sagamore Water District
Kerry Mackin	Ipswich River Watershed Assoc.
Marie Studer	Mass Bays Program
John R. Kennelly	Corps of Engineers
Mike Gildesgame	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Michele Drury	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Vicki Gartland	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Deborah Graham	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Peter Phippen	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Andrew Gottlieb	DEP, Bureau of Resource Protection
Lealdon Langley	DEP, Office of Watershed Management
Steven DeGabriele	DEP, Environmental Results Program
John Reinhardt	DEP, Environmental Results Program

Agenda Item #2: Staff Reports

Corps of Engineers Section 22 and FPMS Proposals Gildesgame reviewed the eight proposals received, noting comments by John Kennelly of the Corps. The intent of the planning assistance programs is to allow states to access expertise in the Corps. The WRC decided to ask the proponents to rework the submittals in response to the Corps comments and to discuss further and vote on prioritization at the next meeting.

Mackin described the two proposals for the Ipswich river; 1) the impacts of "flood-skimming" and out-of-basin transfers on the basin and 2) impact of groundwater pumpage on streamflow. Phippen added that this information would benefit watershed group decisions.

Agenda Item #1: Adoption of the Minutes of August 8, 1996

Clayton noted a spelling correction, page 2, Silver, not Sliver Lake.

A motion was made by Clayton and seconded by Veale to

ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF AUGUST 8, 1996, AS AMENDED.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #3: Water Needs Forecasts for No. Sagamore Water District (Bourne)

Drury summarized the district's request to renew their WMA permit for more water in the South Coastal Basin, from 0.42 to 0.62 mgd. The district reached their 2010 water use projection of 0.35 mgd in 1995. Their service population is projected to increase, and the Scusset Beach State Reservation has requested water service. In addition, DEP has required a flushing program in conjunction with a corrosion control program.

Langley added that the existing permit has a condition that in order to protect herring they must maintain flow at the outlet to Great Herring Pond or alternate wells. The Zone II has not been delineated, but will include evaluating impacts on herring of any streamflow changes. Anderson said that Army Corps pumping tests show that both wells come from the Great Herring Pond and they have always been in compliance with the minimum flow condition.

Clayton suggested that DEM implement all necessary water conservation measures at Scusset and that although No. Sagamore has a tight system, DEP require demand management as a part of the permit. The WRC will vote on the forecast in October.

Agenda Item #4: Status of implementation of the dissolved metals standard and DEP's ecological study for site-specific metals standards

Gottlieb said that the dissolved metals standard adopted by DEP in the spring of 1996 was one component in a strategy to improve effluent quality that also includes Best Management Practices, Source Reduction and Corrosion Control. POTWs are given a schedule for implementing metal reduction.

DEP began a joint study with USGS to look at the possibility of using Site Specific Criteria to replace the Gold Book standard. The study is underway and being conducted in phases, with \$175,000 still needed. There hasn't been much change as a result of the regulatory changes, as EPA uses conversion and translator factors which default back to total metal values. Clayton asked whether it makes sense to fund the study. Gottlieb said that although towns could pay for site specific analysis, EPA cannot tell a plant that their permit would be any different after a study, as other issues, such as downstream discharges, may impact the receiving waters.

| Agenda Item #5: DEP's Environmental Results Program

DeGabriele distributed and described proposed rule changes under C. 21 for photo processors. An ENF will be filed, public hearings held and an updated version of the regulations will be given to the WRC. The Environmental Results Program (ERP) goal is to implement standards and increase flexibility by:

(1) substituting performance standards and certification for permits; DEP expects this will be more effective than permitting as industry can change technology as long as they meet the compliance certificate that they sign.

(2) providing compliance information by industry sector in an easy to use work book format rather than just giving them the rules.

There are three sets of proposed rules; general rules for company certification, and sector specific rules for dry cleaners and photo processors. They are also looking at sewer overflows and printing. The photo processing rules, 314 CMR, apply to discharges to public sewers only and exclude NPDES discharges. Discharge to septic systems is not allowed and holding tanks must be used. If a local permit is more stringent it must be met.

Veale fully endorsed the proposals and suggested the ERP meet with the Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM) to request funding.

.. • □ • ..

DLG